

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

In the Drawings:

Please replace drawing sheets 1, 5, 13, and 15 (showing Figs. 1, 5-6, 13, and 15-16) with the newly-submitted figures attached herewith on separate sheets.

The following are the changes and/or corrections made to the drawings:

Fig. 1 has been corrected to indicate service provider network 32.

Fig. 5 has been corrected to provide a description for 1-bit cell loss priority (CLP) indicator 82. Payload 80 in Fig. 5 has been corrected to provide description on a single line. Fig. 5 has been corrected to indicate header error control 84.

Fig. 6 has been corrected to provide a description for 1-bit cell loss priority (CLP) indicator 82. Fig. 6 has been corrected to indicate header error control 84.

Fig. 13 has been corrected to indicate cross-connect structure 192.

Fig. 16 has been corrected to indicate base VCI 240. Descriptions for interface ID 234, channel 236, base VPI 238 and base VCI 240 on Fig. 16 have been corrected to align to reference characters.

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed May 6, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 3-37 and 39-66, as amended, are respectfully requested.

1. Present Status of Patent Application

Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 3-37 and 39-66 remain pending in the present application. More specifically, claims 3, 22, 39, 53 and 59 are directly amended; and claims 1, 2 and 38 are canceled. These amendments are specifically described hereinafter. It is believed that the foregoing amendments and additions add no new matter to the present application.

2. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 11-37 and 45-66 are allowable over the prior art of record. Applicants observe that the Office Action summary indicates claims 1-64 are pending in the application and that claims 11-37 and 45-64 are allowable over the prior art of record. The Office Action summary of 64 total claims is in conflict because claims 65 and 66 were previously allowed. Applicants submit that claims 3-37 and 39-66 are allowable over the prior art of record.

3. Corrections to Drawings

Applicants have amended drawings for Figs. 1, 5, 6, 13 and 16 for consistency throughout the disclosure. The amendments to Figs. 1, 5, 6, 13 and 16 merely present the drawings in better form for issuance and do not supplement the original disclosure in any manner by correcting minor typographical errors and omissions. Replacement sheets of drawings corresponding to Figs. 1, 5, 6, 13 and 16 are attached hereto.

Applicants observe that amendments to the drawings are not made in response to an objection made by the Examiner. While corrected drawings are submitted after the filing date of the application, the corrected drawings are not used to overcome any insufficiency of the Specification. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the drawings.

4. Corrections to the Specification

Applicants have amended the Specification for consistency throughout the disclosure. The amendments to the Specification, more specifically, the brief description of the drawings for FIGS. 9-13, 14A-C and 15-16, merely correct minor typographical errors and omissions.

Applicants observe that the amendments made to the Specification are not made in response to an objection made by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the Specification.

5. Specification Objection

The specification has been objected to for containing various informalities. In response to the objection, Applicants have amended the specification to correct these informalities.

Although these amendments effect various changes to the specification, it is respectfully asserted that no new matter has been added. In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification is not objectionable, and therefore respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

6. Abstract Objection

The abstract of the disclosure has been objected to because it uses claim language, such as -- means --. Through this Response, all such legal language has been removed. In view of that amendment, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

7. Claim Objection

Claim 22 has been objected to for containing informalities. In response to the objection, Applicants have amended claim 22 to correct these informalities. In view of the above-noted claim amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is not objectionable and respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicants have amended claims 53 and 59 to correct informalities. The amendment to claims 53 and 59 merely present the claims in better form for issuance and do not narrow the scope of claims 53 and 59 in any manner by correcting minor typographical errors.

Applicants observe that amendments made to claims 53 and 59 are not made in response to an objection made by the Examiner. Although these amendments effect various changes to claims 53 and 59, it is respectfully asserted that no new matter has been added. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment to claims 53 and 59.

8. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-10 and 38-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that

“In cl. 1, it is unclear whether the means for automatically configuring of ln. 6 is the same as the multiplexer for automatically configuring of cl. 3.

In cl. 38, it is unclear whether the means for automatically configuring of ln. 4 is the same as the switch for automatically configuring of cl. 39.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

Claim 3 recites the limitation ‘the plurality of data communications channels’ in ln. 4-5 and ‘the plurality of digital subscriber line communications channels’ in ln. 8-9.

Claim 39 recites the limitation ‘the plurality of network-side communications channels’ in ln. 3-4 and ln. 11 and ‘the plurality of user-side communications channels’ in ln. 7-8 and ln. 12.”


In response to the rejection, Applicants have amended claims 3 and 39; and canceled claims 1, 2 and 38. Applicants wish to clarify that the amendments to claims 3 and 39 are not made in response to any rejection made by the Examiner based upon cited art of record. Furthermore, these amendments to claims 3 and 39 made in response to the rejection under § 112, second paragraph, do not narrow the scope of claims 3 and 39 in any manner.

In view of those amendments, it is respectfully asserted that amended claims 3-10 and 39-44 overcome the objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 3-37 and 39-66 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Karen G. Hazzah
Reg. No. 48,472

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500